

Amendments to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings. Specifically, the Examiner stated that the reference sign "4" mentioned in the specification was not included in Figure 3. Applicant has submitted herewith a Replacement Drawing for Figure 3 incorporating such reference. Support for such incorporation can be found at page 15, first full sentence. The Replacement Drawings is attached at the end of this response. Applicant requests withdrawal of such objection.

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated June 2, 2008, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on September 2, 2008. Applicants request entry and consideration of the above noted amendments and the following remarks in response to the Office Action.

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the interview of July 15, 2008.

Claims 15-30 are currently pending in the application. Claim 15 has been amended.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants have submitted herewith an Information Disclosure Statement containing the reference cited in the Search Report dated October 28, 2005.

Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings. Discussion of such objection is above and a Replacement Drawing is submitted herewith. Applicants request withdrawal of such objection.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claim 15 for informalities. Applicants have amended claim 15 as suggested by the Examiner. Such amendments are to correct typographical errors.

Applicants request withdrawal of the objections and allowance of the claims.

Claim Rejections

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 15-27, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tharappel (U.S. 2003/0114608), alone or in view of the evidence provided in Boulares et al. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tharappel, alone or in view of the evidence provided in Boulares et al., and further in view of Norwood (U.S. 3,248,179).

Applicants have amended claim 15 so that the catalyst provided is a chromium based catalyst. Support for such an amendment can be found in the original claims and at least at page 1, first paragraph. As discussed in the interview, the references do not teach, show or suggest the use of a chromium catalyst with an anti-fouling polymer.

In particular, as discussed in the interview, Applicants argue that Tharappel discloses the use of an antifouling agent with a catalyst system, but such catalyst system is not a chromium catalyst (see Tharappel, page 8, paragraph [0071]). Additionally, Applicants argue that antifouling agents are generally known to act as poisons for chromium-based catalyst systems, therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify Tharappel, alone or in view of the evidence provided in Boulares or in further view of Norwood, to achieve the currently amended claims. Therefore, it was unexpected that the addition of the specific antifouling agent resulted in improved activity of the chromium-based catalyst systems and that it did not act as a poison.

In conclusion, Applicants submit that the references cited in the Office Action, neither alone nor in combination, teach, show, or suggest the presently amended claims. Having addressed all issues set out in the Office Action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request the same.

Date

July 29, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Diane L. Kilpatrick-Lee

Diane L. Kilpatrick-Lee

Registration No. 56,211

FINA TECHNOLOGY, INC.

P.O. Box 674412

Houston, Texas, 77267-4412

Telephone: 713-483-5390

Facsimile: 713-483-5384

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Replacement Drawings